

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
CITY OF CHICAGO,)
PEOPLE OF COOK COUNTY,)
) No. 00-0789
Petition for emergency)
rulemaking and expedited)
investigation.)

Chicago, Illinois
January 9, 2001

Met pursuant to notice at 2:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

MS. ERIN O'CONNELL-DIAZ,
Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

MAYER, BROWN and PLATT
MR. STEPHEN J. MATTSON
190 South LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Appearing for Norther Illinois Gas Company
d/b/a Nicor Gas;

1 APPEARANCES (Continued)

2 MS. LEIJUANA DOSS and
3 MS. MARIE SPICUZZA
4 69 West Washington, Suite 700
Chicago, Illinois
5 Appearing for People of Cook County;

6 DEFREES & FISKE
7 MR. W. MICHAEL SEIDEL
8 200 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100
Chicago, Illinois 60604
9 Appearing for Central Illinois Light
Company;

10 MR. STEVEN G. REVETHIS and
11 MR. ANDREW G. HUCKMAN
12 160 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800
Chicago, Illinois 60601
13 Appearing for staff;

14 MR. RONALD D. JOLLY
15 30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 900
Chicago, Illinois 60602
16 Appearing for City of Chicago;

17 MR. GERARD T. FOX
18 MR. TIMOTHY WALSH and
19 MS. MARY KLYASHEFF
20 130 East Randolph Drive, 23rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Appearing for Peoples Gas Light and Coke
Company and North Shore Gas Company;

21 MR. ERIC BRAMLET
22 PO Box 278
Mt. Carmel, Illinois 62863
Appearing for Mt. Carmel Public Utility
Company;

MR. RANDY CLEMMONS and MR. JOE LACHMANNON
500 South 27th Street
Decatur Illinois 62521
Appearing for Illinois Power Company;

1 APPEARANCES (Cont'd)

2 MR. THOMAS BYRNE and
3 MR. RONALD K. EVANS
4 PO Box 26149
5 St. Louis, Missouri 63166
6 Appearing for Central Illinois Public
7 Service Company;

8 MR. ROBERT JARED and
9 MS. KAREN HUSEINGA
10 106 East Second Street
11 PO Box 435
12 Davenport, Iowa 52808
13 Appearing for Mid American;

14 MR. STANLEY MORRIS
15 Three North Capital Plaza
16 Springfield, Illinois 62701
17 Appearing for Illinois Gas Company.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
Barbara A. Perkovich, CSR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

I N D E X

<u>Witnesses:</u>	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	<u>Re-direct</u>	<u>Re-cross</u>	<u>By Judge</u>
None.					

E X H I B I T S

<u>Number</u>	<u>For Identification</u>	<u>In Evidence</u>
None.		

1 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Pursuant to direction of
2 the Illinois Commerce Commission, I now call Docket
3 No. 00-0789. And this is in the matter of the City
4 of Chicago, People of Cook County, petition for
5 emergency rule making and expedited investigation.

6 May I have the appearances for the
7 record, please.

8 MR. JOLLY: For the City of Chicago, Ronald D.
9 Jolly, 30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 900, Chicago,
10 Illinois 60602.

11 MS. DOSS: Leijuana Doss and Marie Spicuzza, Cook
12 County State's Attorney's Office, 69 West
13 Washington, Suite 700, Chicago, Illinois 60602
14 appearing on behalf of the People of cook County.

15 MR. HUCKMAN: For the staff of the Illinois
16 Commerce Commission, Steven G. Revethis and Andrew
17 G. Huckman, 160 North LaSalle Street, Chicago 60601.

18 MS. KLYASHEFF: Appearing for the Peoples Gas
19 Light and Coke Company and North Shore Gas Company,
20 Mary Klyasheff, Gerard T. Fox and Timothy Walsh, 130
21 East Randolph, Chicago 60601.

22 MR. MATTSON: Northern Illinois Gas Company doing

1 business as Nicor Gas by Stephen J. Mattson of the
2 firm of Mayer, Brown and Platt, 190 South LaSalle
3 Street, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

4 MR. SEIDEL: W. Michael Seidel for the law firm
5 of Defrees and Fiske, 200 South Michigan Avenue,
6 Suite 1100, Chicago, Illinois 60604 on behalf of
7 Central Illinois Light Company.

8 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Springfield?

9 MR. CLEMMONS: This is Randy Clemmons on behalf
10 of myself and Joe Lachmannon on behalf of Illinois
11 Power Company, 500 South 27th Street, Decatur,
12 Illinois, 62521-2200.

13 MR. BYRNE: Thomas Byrne, B-y-r-n-e and Ronald K.
14 Evans appearing on behalf of Central Illinois Public
15 Service Company, PO Box 26149, St. Louis, Missouri
16 63166.

17 MR. JARED: Robert P. Jared, J-a-r-e-d and Karen
18 Huseinga, H-u-s-e-i-n-g-a, 106 East Second Street,
19 Post Office Box 435, Davenport, Iowa 52808 on behalf
20 of Mid American.

21 MR. MORRIS: Stanley Morris of Quinn Johnson,
22 Three North Capital Plaza, Springfield 62701,

1 (217)753-1133 on behalf of Illinois Gas Company.

2 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Are those all the
3 appearances in Springfield?

4 MR. CLEMMON: Yes.

5 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: We have one more appearance
6 in Chicago.

7 MR. BRAMLET: Eric Bramlet on behalf of Mount
8 Carmel Public Utility Company, Box Office Box 278,
9 Mount Carmel, Illinois 62863.

10 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Let the record reflect
11 that this is the initial status hearing in this
12 matter. And I would note that I have read through
13 the petition, obviously, and I do know that some of
14 the things that are in the prayer for relief with
15 regard to the budget plan balances, I think, with
16 regard to Peoples and North Shore, I think that they
17 have announced that they, in fact, are going to have
18 the budget plan balances -- budget plan available to
19 customers. Is that correct?

20 MR. JOLLY: It's my understanding that they are
21 offering that throughout the EDS.

22 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Are there any other parts

1 of this petition that are being addressed by the
2 companies prior to us getting into scheduling, any
3 other issues that might be resolved?

4 MR. MATTSON: Yes, your Honor. On behalf of Nicor
5 Gas, I think that the Commission is aware, and that
6 the parties are aware that in November Nicor Gas
7 announced and implemented a customer payment support
8 plan which is in addition to its convenient payment
9 plan.

10 I can tell you that about 18,000
11 residential customers have already enrolled, and
12 this is sort of an averaging approach that allows
13 customers to average a payment of their bills from
14 the date that they contact the company, through
15 September 2001.

16 And I can tell you that the company is
17 currently work on a permanent traditional type of
18 budget placement plan, a 12 month plan that it
19 expects to file with the Commission not later than
20 the 1st of February of 2001. So I think all of us
21 recognize that with the advent of high prices, we
22 need to do whatever is reasonable to try to benefit

1 our customers.

2 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So basically,
3 Mr. Mattson, what you are saying is that the budget
4 plan, unless parties had signed up for it prior to,
5 say, today, is going to be available to customers?

6 MR. MATTSON: Yeah, I think that's a fair way to
7 say it. We have have had a convenient payment plan
8 in place for probably the last 40 years. That was
9 modified further to allow a smoothing of the costs
10 of gas under the customer payment support plan. And
11 now we are planning on taking it another step by
12 making a filing on or before the 1st of February
13 with respect to a budget payment plan.

14 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: I suppose this is news to
15 you, but I just thought that if we could get --

16 MR. JOLLY: I'm not aware of that, and I guess
17 the prayer for relief, the concern was initially
18 Peoples Gas, who the City is solely concerned with,
19 did not offer their budget plan -- customers could
20 not enroll at any time of the year, it was limited.
21 And subsequently they've changed that, and we have
22 appreciate that and we think that's the appropriate

1 thing to do.

2 Now, I don't know as to Nicor's plan,
3 their plan that they are going to implement in
4 February, if that will be available at any time, I
5 don't know the details of that.

6 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Ms. Klyasheff, could you
7 advise us as to what Peoples plan is?

8 MS. KLYASHEFF: Peoples and North Shore's budget
9 plan is such that one can sign up at any time of the
10 year, and it runs for 12 months. And that was
11 implemented a few months ago, actually, with the new
12 customer information system, but it is a 12-month
13 plan.

14 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Have all the parties seen
15 this schedule, proposed schedule?

16 MR. JOLLY: I e-mailed it this morning to the
17 parties that are on the service list, including the
18 parties that have entered appearances in
19 Springfield. They can speak as to whether or not
20 they have received it. But I believe all the
21 parties have a copy of it.

22 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Let me just throw this out

1 to the parties, and I do note that this is filed as
2 an emergency rule making and usually in traditional
3 rule makings we have a period for workshops and, of
4 course, due to the timeliness nature of what we are
5 all being faced with this winter, I'm wondering if
6 it would be a good idea, and I really look to the
7 parties to try to, you know, give me that
8 information, if for instance we schedule, and I do
9 have this schedule that was tendered to me by Mr.
10 Jolly, what if we did a short period of time, say
11 like a week, where the parties could do what we
12 would usually do in the traditional workshops and
13 explore the issues that are raised in the petition
14 that is filed?

15 I'm wondering if that might be fruitful
16 for the parties to come to some agreement with
17 regard to the remaining -- we do have these budget
18 plan issues that are out there, that seem to be
19 somewhat resolved, but there are other issues that
20 are presented in this petition. Could the parties
21 have just an initial reaction to that?

22 MR. JOLLY: I don't think we are necessarily

1 opposed to that and we have been meeting over the
2 past several months with representatives of Peoples
3 Gas, and I don't think there is anything wrong
4 with doing that. And again, the prayer for relief
5 here applies to all gas utilities in the state.

6 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Right, it's not just the
7 City.

8 MR. JOLLY: And I understand that Peoples Gas has
9 implemented many of these measures, but there are
10 other utilities involved that I'm not certain what
11 the status of their programs are.

12 MS. DOSS: Cook County would not be opposed for a
13 week to discuss issues. However, do you contemplate
14 having a status at the end and then having the
15 schedule implemented that we proposed from a week
16 after? If we don't, would Com Ed's (sic) be due a
17 week after?

18 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, number one I haven't
19 really looked at the schedule that was proposed by
20 you and Mr. Jolly, and I haven't got any input from
21 the other parties, I certainly would want to keep
22 this on an expedited schedule. I thought possibly

1 it would be fruitful for the parties to have some
2 time to iron out the issues that are raised in the
3 current filing and maybe come to some agreement and
4 that certainly would be a lot quicker than everybody
5 going through a whole hearing process, and filing
6 briefs and things of that nature. So I really would
7 look to the parties for their comment on that. Mr.
8 Mattson.

9 MR. MATTSON: Well, we certainly would have no
10 objection to talking. We have been talking with the
11 State's Attorney's office from time to time. I
12 guess a question I have is it's as much timing as
13 anything else. We have, as I said, committed to
14 file a plan by the 1st of February, which may or may
15 not satisfy the concerns that the parties have,
16 particularly the State's Attorney.

17 And I don't know if it's realistic to
18 extend the discussion period so that people will
19 have a look at that plan or not. I guess I would
20 note that even under the schedule that Mr. Jolly has
21 circulated, the proposed schedule, we are getting
22 probably into March at the earliest, even under the

1 proposed schedule before anything realistically
2 could be done. And it might well -- I'm not going
3 to argue whether there need to be hearings or what
4 have you, there is an argument that it will be
5 productive to work through this over a period of
6 somewhat greater than a week. I understand that the
7 position that the City and the State's Attorney have
8 taken here as well.

9 So that may or may not be realistic. I
10 guess from Nicor Gas' perspective, in the time frame
11 around February 1st, there is going to be more to
12 talk about than there is next week.

13 MS. DOSS: Well, the concern I have is that we
14 have, Cook County has been having negotiations with
15 Nicor. At this point Nicor, although they are
16 indicating their plan to file a budget plan for 12
17 months on the 1st, it's still behind. Peoples has
18 already initiated a budget plan payment for the 12
19 months. They have already done automatic
20 enrollment, at least for January.

21 So as time passes on, these opportunities
22 are lingering for consumers to sign up and try to

1 alleviate some of the problems they are having
2 paying their bills. So as an emergency rule making,
3 the Commission can act without any type of testimony
4 or comments. This is just an opportunity to give
5 the utilities an opportunity to expedite some
6 concerns that they have so that we can go ahead and
7 do something to alleviate the emergency situation
8 that exists now.

9 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: And what you are alluding
10 to is the 150 days that that rule would be in place
11 until such time that we had a normal rule making
12 proceeding?

13 MS. DOSS: Exactly.

14 MR. JOLLY: I would agree with the comments by
15 Ms. Doss and would add that while I understand that
16 this schedule stretches out, I agree with
17 Mr. Mattson the earliest we are looking at is
18 probably the beginning of March before anything is
19 resolved. Given the time pressures, this was like
20 the most compressed schedule I thought was feasible.

21 However, as the petition indicates, I
22 think there are going to be issues for customers

1 that are going to linger beyond the winter heating
2 season. Bills are piling up, record bills, bills
3 twice as high as they were last year, and I think
4 that some of the matters that are raised in the
5 petition could help resolve them, even going into
6 spring and into the summer.

7 So while I understand that, you know,
8 maybe this goes, even the schedule as proposed goes
9 into March, I think there are things that can be
10 done that could be helpful.

11 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Any of the other parties
12 that filed an appearance, Ms. Klyasheff.

13 MS. KLYASHEFF: Well, as Mr. Jolly indicated,
14 Peoples Gas has met periodically with the City, and
15 as far as I'm aware continues to do so to the extent
16 there is an interest in continuing these meetings.
17 I believe we may also have met with Cook County on a
18 couple of occasions, so obviously we don't oppose
19 continuing meetings to the extent both sides still
20 have issues to discuss, or we can have productive
21 meetings.

22 In terms of how to proceed with this, we

1 don't oppose the notion of going forward by notice
2 and comment. The issue of whether or not the
3 Commission is prepared to adopt an emergency rule at
4 this point is another issue. And the adequacy of
5 what is on the table in that regard, is something
6 that we haven't got to yet.

7 MR. MATTSON: And just to make it clear, we are
8 happy to meet with people to continue to meet with
9 people. My only point is that at least on the Nicor
10 Gas side, there will be more to talk about around
11 the first of this coming month than there is at this
12 point in time because we will have filed a proposal
13 at that point which will give us something concrete
14 to look at.

15 MS. DOSS: Is this simply a proposal or will it
16 be implemented by the 1st?

17 MR. MATTSON: This will be a filing to be made
18 with the Commission. So I'm not going to be
19 presumptive, it will be up to the Commission to
20 approve it. We certainly would hope they would, and
21 we hope that the parties would look at it and say we
22 support it.

1 MS. DOSS: Well, again, I would say that we have
2 no opposition to a week of, you know, if you want to
3 schedule a workshop within that week, then following
4 that initial comments, and perhaps if the proposal
5 is ready, you can file that with your comments or
6 however you want to do it. But I think we should
7 proceed as quickly and expeditiously as possible.

8 MR. MATTSON: We are not opposing proceeding
9 quickly and expeditiously, but I think it's also
10 important to do so productively. And I can't say
11 much more about that. We can't make a plan
12 available for people to look at before there is a
13 plan that's completed. It's impossible by
14 definition.

15 MR. JOLLY: It seems that the outlines of a plan
16 would be formed or at least contemplated and there
17 could be some explanation of where Nicor expects it
18 is going. I guess I just think that we should set a
19 schedule, that we can continue to talk, we can
20 continue to talk after initial comments are filed,
21 but I think that we set a schedule and move forward,
22 and, you know, we can meet next week.

1 If there is productive talks, we can
2 meet -- continue them. I have no opposition to
3 that.

4 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Mr. Reventhis, any comment?

5 MR. REVETHIS: Certainly the staff encourages any
6 dialogue between the parties and the staff certainly
7 would participate also, and I think the staff feels
8 -- they do feel that it is a good idea, any ongoing
9 dialogue that could be helpful to the consumers of
10 the state certainly would be positive. So we are
11 certainly in favor of that.

12 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Springfield, any comments
13 down there?

14 MR. CLEMMON: Illinois power would be in favor of
15 any dialogue that could be helpful. We have long
16 had methods in place to levelize and otherwise help
17 cut conditional and price height variations and we,
18 after any dialogue, we just like a chance to explain
19 those methods which we think in some case may be
20 more beneficial to consumers than the emergency
21 provisions being presented.

22 MR. MATTSON: Well, would it make sense to set a

1 workshop date and location, and then to set a status
2 hearing to see where we go from there?

3 MR. JOLLY: I would also like to set a schedule
4 -- I think we also need to answer the fundamental
5 question, we are notice and comment basis and Ms.
6 Klyasheff has indicated that Peoples does not oppose
7 that, and I was curious as to whether other parties,
8 how they feel about that.

9 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: That's my next question.
10 Now that we've gotten through what the people feel
11 about the workshops, it seems that the petitioners
12 here obviously want to go forward and what are the
13 parties' thoughts on that?

14 MR. MATTSON: I would join Ms. Klyasheff. We
15 would not oppose a notice and comment approach. We
16 would not be enamored about the schedule that
17 Mr. Jolly has outlined, given the stakes at issue
18 here, and I don't think we even need to get into the
19 emergency rule aspect of it. I think it's pretty
20 clear that the petitioners have not set forth a
21 basis that would justify adopting an emergency rule.
22 But we would not demand hearings.

1 MS. KLYASHEFF: And as I said, we would support a
2 notice and comment process, but like
3 Mr. Mattson, the dates that were proposed we would
4 have concerns with.

5 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Staff?

6 MR. REVETHIS: The staff is agreeable to the
7 notice and comment process, Madam Examiner, also.

8 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: How about the schedule?

9 MR. REVETHIS: Well, the staff certainly agrees
10 that this should be done in an expedited basis, so
11 we will do our best to accommodate any schedule that
12 the parties agree upon under the circumstances. We
13 will try to focus any resources that are necessary
14 under the circumstances.

15 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Springfield?

16 MR. CLEMMON: Illinois Power of course would not
17 object to the notice and comment procedure.

18 MR. JARED: Mid American has no objection to the
19 notice and comment procedure. We note that the
20 proposed schedule including the expedited one, we
21 will do our best to accommodate that schedule, or
22 whatever schedule the parties agree upon.

1 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: What was that last part
2 that you said I couldn't hear you.

3 MR. JARED: Or whatever schedule the parties
4 agree upon, or is set by the examiner.

5 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: What I'm hearing is nobody
6 is really objecting to the notice and comment
7 period, but there is a problem with the schedule as
8 it stands.

9 MR. JOLLY: Before the hearing, Mr. Revethis and
10 I --

11 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Would it be helpful
12 for --

13 MR. JOLLY: To go off the record?

14 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: To go off the record, give
15 the parties time to work out a schedule and you will
16 have figured out a schedule.

17 MR. JOLLY: Okay.

18 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: We are going to go off the
19 record for 10 minutes, and the parties will discuss
20 the schedule as it is proposed by City and Cook. It
21 seems that the parties -- the other parties once
22 presented with this have some problem with the

1 schedule. So in order to hopefully have some sort
2 of schedule when we walk out of here today, the
3 parties -- we will reconvene and hopefully they will
4 have worked out some agreeable schedule.

5 And additionally, if you want to think
6 about possibly using next week as the workshop week
7 that we were talking about, that, you know, might be
8 a prudent thing to do. So that would certainly be
9 something to figure into your schedule.

10 (Whereupon, there was an
11 off-the-record discussion.)

12 MR. JOLLY: We reached an agreement on the
13 schedule during our off-the-record discussion. And
14 if you wish, Madam Examiner, I can provide that for
15 the record.

16 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Could you please,
17 Mr. Jolly.

18 MR. JOLLY: We have agreed on a workshop on
19 January 17th at 9:30 and a status that afternoon, if
20 that works for you at 3:30.

21 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Um-hmm.

22 MR. JOLLY: Initial comments will be due on

1 January 26th. Reply comments and/or draft orders on
2 February 8th. The Hearing Examiner's proposed order
3 on February 23rd, briefs on exceptions on March 2nd,
4 and parties agree to also have -- provide for reply
5 to exceptions and those will be due on March 8th.

6 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Could you after the March
7 date, could you tell me the schedule again, I'm
8 sorry.

9 MR. JOLLY: The brief on exceptions is March 2nd
10 and the reply to exceptions on March 8th. And there
11 was also another issue raised off the record,
12 apparently during your comments you referred to the
13 transition to permanent rules. We are not asking
14 for permanent rules at this point, we are only
15 asking for emergency rules be set.

16 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Is that why you didn't
17 request an amendment of Part 2880?

18 MR. JOLLY: That's right. We just asked for
19 emergency rules. We view this hopefully as a
20 temporary situation and hopefully won't repeat
21 itself next year. So at this point that's all we
22 are requesting are emergency rules.

1 MR. REVETHIS: And also, Madam Examiner, the
2 parties will confer as to the site of the workshop.
3 We will all examine our facilities and pick the most
4 convenient site for all parties. As we said we are
5 going to begin at 9:30.

6 MR. MATTSON: Well, it will be in Chicago.

7 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: You mean the workshop is
8 going to start at 9:30?

9 MR. REVETHIS: Yes, that's what we contemplate as
10 Mr. Jolly indicated. The status, we can do a phone
11 status with you at 3:30.

12 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Let me just get something
13 clear for the record, Mr. Mattson, with regard to
14 what the company is filing on February 1st. What is
15 that?

16 MR. MATTSON: The company will be making a filing
17 on or before February 1st which will be a 12 month
18 budget payment plan.

19 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: And is this going to be a
20 revision of the payment plan that currently is in
21 effect?

22 MR. MATTSON: Yes, what we will propose is that it

1 will replace the payment plans that are currently in
2 effect.

3 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: And is that going to be a
4 special permission filing?

5 MR. MATTSON: That is my inclination and the
6 company's inclination at this point that it would be
7 a special permission filing.

8 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So that will be a 45 day?

9 MR. MATTSON: No, if it is a special permission
10 filing, the Commission could act on less than a
11 45-day notice.

12 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Ms. Klyasheff or
13 Mr. Walsh, maybe you could advise me with regard to
14 Peoples and North Shore, when they just, I believe
15 it was in the month of December, allowed people to
16 sign up for the budget plan, how did --

17 MS. KLYASHEFF: Peoples implemented this as part
18 of its new customer information system. It was done
19 several months ago. The ability to enter the budget
20 plan at any time for a 12 month period.

21 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Not during certain times?

22 MS. KLYASHEFF: Was not done in connection with

1 the gas costs, it was done with our new customer
2 information system.

3 JUDGE O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Okay. That schedule looks
4 fine. I would hope the parties can utilize that
5 January 17th date to hopefully maybe resolve some
6 issues. I know this is a difficult time for
7 everybody, and I know everybody in this room
8 probably, unless they've got some different kind of
9 heat, are not liking what they get in their mailbox,
10 so this is kind of an odd year that we are having.

11 So hopefully that January 17th date might
12 help you in resolving some of the issues that are
13 raised by the petition that is filed. And I look
14 forward to hearing from the parties on the afternoon
15 of the 17th. And we will go forward with the
16 schedule as agreed to by the parties. And this
17 matter now will be continued to January 17th at
18 3:30.

19 (Whereupon the above-entitled
20 matter was continued January 17,
21 2001 at 3:30 p.m.)
22

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF COOK) SS:
CASE NUMBER 00-0789
TITLE: CITY OF CHICAGO, PEOPLE OF COOK COUNTY,
Petition for emergency rule making and
expedited investigation.

I, Barbara A. Perkovich, do hereby
certify that I am a court reporter contracted by
SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, of Chicago, Illinois; that
I reported in shorthand the evidence taken and the
proceedings had on the hearing on the above-entitled
case on the 9th day of January A.D.
2001; that the foregoing 27 pages are a true
and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken
as aforesaid, and contains all of the proceedings
direct by the Commission or other person authorized
by it to conduct the said hearing to be
stenographically reported.

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 18th day of
January A.D. 2001.

Barbara A. Perkovich
Reporter.